



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/822,227

04/09/2004

Jurgen Baus

BAUS

1320

20151 7590 02/01/2008

HENRY M FEIEREISEN, LLC

350 FIFTH AVENUE

SUITE 4714

NEW YORK, NY 10118

EXAMINER

TIV, BACKHEAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/01/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/822,227

Applicant(s)

BAUS ET AL.

Examiner

Backhean Tiv

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION:

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 12-15 were added in the Amendment filed on 11/30/07. This action is made **FINAL**.

Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS filed on 11/30/07 have been considered, However DE 19904331, Profibus aus Wikipedia and Fluidtechnik were not considered because there were no English translation of those documents.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1,11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,23 of copending Application

No. 10/822,224 in view of US Patent 7,035,634 issued to Mead et al.(Mead). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 23 of copending application 10/822,224 teaches all the limitations of claim 1 of the present application. The only difference between the present application and the copending application is, the present application has "data exchanged between the at least one automation device and the data conversion unit and **between** the automation device"; while, the copending application, has "data exchanged between the at least one automation device and the data conversion unit and **among** the automation device". It is obvious to one ordinary skill in the art that if a device is among another device that it can also be between devices.

Copending Application No.10/822,224 does not explicitly teach using quality data for transmission of data.

Mead teaches quality data for transmission of data(col.3, lines 44-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of copending application 10/822,224 to include using quality data to transmit data as taught by Mead in order to take criteria into consideration for transmission of data.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of copending application 10/822,224 and Mead in order to take criteria into consideration for transmission of data.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,785,730 issued to Taylor in view of US Publication 2001/0025322 issued to Song et al.(Song) in further view of US Patent 7,035,634 issued to Mead et al.(Mead):

As per claim 1, Taylor teaches a data transmission device for accessing from a remote unit at least one automation device(Abstract), comprising a data conversion unit connected between the remote unit and at least one automation device and configured to convert data between a first communication protocol and a second communication protocol(Abstract, col.3, lines 24-37), wherein the data are exchanged between the at least one automation device and the data conversion unit and between the automation devices by using the first communication protocol(col.5, lines 1-34), and wherein the data are exchanged between the data conversion unit and the remote unit according to a second communication protocol(col.7, lines 40-50).

Taylor does not explicitly teach a web server.

Song teaches a web server(Abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Taylor to include a web server as taught by Song in order to control devices through a web page(Song, para.0011).

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Taylor and Song in order to provide a system to control non IP-based network devices with IP-based network devices(Song, para.0011).

Taylor in view of Song does not explicitly teach quality data, a transmission mode for transmitting the data between the data conversion unit and the remote unit by using the second communication protocol based on the quality data.

Mead teaches using selection criteria which includes the urgency of data in selecting an appropriate communication mode from among various options(col.3, lines 44-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Taylor in view of Song to include quality data, a transmission mode for transmitting the data between the data conversion unit and the remote unit by using the second communication protocol based on the quality data as taught by Mead in order to take criteria into consideration for transmission of data.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Taylor, Song and Mead in order to take criteria into consideration for transmission of data.

As per claim 2, the device of claim 1, and further comprising a data processing unit connected between the data conversion unit and the remote unit, so that the data

conversion unit exchanges data with the remote unit via the data processing unit(Taylor, Fig.1).

As per claim 3, the device of claim 2, wherein the data processing unit includes a web server(Song, Abstract). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 4, the device of claim 2, and further including an operating and monitoring device connected between the data conversion unit and the data processing unit(Taylor, Fig.1, col.4, lines 34-67).

As per claim 5, the device of claim 2, wherein the data conversion unit comprises a communication DLL for converting the data that are transmitted from the at least one automation device according to the first communication protocol for further processing by the data processing unit, wherein the data processing unit exchanges data with the remote unit according to the second communication protocol(Taylor, Abstract, Fig.1, col.3, lines 27-47).

As per claim 6, the device of claim 4, wherein the data conversion unit comprises a communication DLL for converting the data that are transmitted from the at least one automation device according to the first communication protocol for further processing by the operating and monitoring device, wherein the data processing unit exchanges data with the remote unit according to the second communication protocol(Taylor, col.5, lines 1-67).

As per claim 7, the device of claim 2, and further comprising a data processing unit, wherein the data conversion unit is operatively connected with the data processing unit and the remote unit, so that the data conversion unit is configured as an expansion

module of a standard browser installed on the data processing unit(Taylor, col.5, lines 1-67, Song, Abstract). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 8, the device of claim 7, wherein the expansion module is configured to be loadable via the Internet and couplable to the standard browser(Song, Abstract). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 9, the device of claim 1, and further comprising a data processing unit, wherein the data conversion unit is operatively connected with the data processing unit and the remote unit, so that the data conversion unit is configured as an application software module installed on the data processing unit(Taylor, Fig.1, col.5, lines 1-35).

As per claim 10, the device of claim 9, wherein the application software module is implemented as one of a database program, an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) program or a data history logging program(Taylor, Fig.1, col.5, lines 1-35).

As per claim 11, Taylor a method for data transmission to access from a remote unit to at least one automation device(Abstract), comprising the steps of:
transmitting the data between the remote unit and the at least one automation device by connecting a data conversion unit there between(Fig.1); exchanging the data between the at least one automation device and the data conversion unit and between the automation devices according to a first communication protocol(Fig.1, col.3, lines 27-38); exchanging the data between the data conversion unit and the remote unit according to a second communication protocol(Fig.1, col.5, lines 1-34); and

causing the data conversion unit to convert the data according to the first communication protocol into the data according to the second communication protocol(Fig.1, col.5, lines 1-34).

Taylor does not explicitly teach a web server.

Song teaches a web server(Abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Taylor to include a web server as taught by Song in order to control devices through a web page(Song, para.0011).

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Taylor and Song in order to provide a system to control non IP-based network devices with IP-based network devices(Song, para.0011).

Taylor in view of Song does not explicitly teach transmitting quality data in the first transmission protocol, and deciding based on the quality data how data are to be transmitted between the data conversion unit and the remote unit by using the second communication protocol.

Mead teaches using selection criteria which includes the urgency of data in selecting an appropriate communication mode from among various options(col.3, lines 44-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Taylor in view of Song to include quality data, a transmission mode for transmitting the data between the data conversion unit and the

remote unit by using the second communication protocol based on the quality data as taught by Mead in order to take criteria into consideration for transmission of data.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Taylor, Song and Mead in order to take criteria into consideration for transmission of data.

As per claims 12, 14, wherein the quality data indicate information about significance of the data or information about urgency of the data to be transmitted, or a combination thereof (Mead, col.3, lines 44-55). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1, 11.

Claims 13, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,785,730 issued to Taylor in view of US Publication 2001/0025322 issued to Song et al. (Song) in further view of US Patent 7,035,634 issued to Mead et al. (Mead) in further view of Office Notice.

Taylor in view of Song in further view of Mead, does not explicitly teach as per claims 13, 15, wherein the quality data determine if the data are to be transmitted between the data conversion unit and the remote unit in markup data transmission and in binary data transmission.

Office Notice is taken. It well known in the art, that data can be transmitted with markup data transmission and binary data transmission.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Taylor in view of Song in further view of

Mead to include transmitting data in markup data transmission and binary data transmission in order to provide a system with different types of data transmission.

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Taylor, Song, and Mead, to include transmitting data in markup data transmission and binary data transmission in order to provide a system with different types of data transmission.

Response to Arguments

The Office withdraws all previous rejections due to applicant's amendments.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571) 272-5654. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/822,227
Art Unit: 2151

Page 12

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Backhean Tiv
2151
1/22/08



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100